

**APPENDIX F: JOINT CITY COUNCIL – PRCS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**



## MEETING NOTES

**PROJECT:** Shoreline PROS Plan  
**MEETING SUBJECT:** Joint City Council and  
PRCS Board Meeting  
**ISSUE DATE:** **JULY 11, 2003**

**MEETING DATE:** July 7, 2003  
**PRESENT:** City Council, PRCS Board, Wendy  
Barry, Rob Beem, Jill Krantz  
**COPY TO:** **WENDY BARRY, MICHAEL  
DAVOLIO, BRUCE POWERS, FILE**

---

### OVERVIEW:

On Monday, July 7, 2003, the Shoreline City Council and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS) Board met jointly. The purpose of this meeting was to inform the City Council and the PRCS Board of progress to date on the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan, engage them in discussion about the future of the Department facilities and services, and to identify issues and challenges. The following outline overviews the discussion.

- ◆ PROS Planning Process
- ◆ Integration with the Comprehensive Plan
- ◆ Community Outreach and Citizen Survey
- ◆ Visioning
- ◆ Issues and Challenges
- ◆ Balancing
- ◆ Questions
- ◆ Next Steps

### GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Following the presentation, Council and Board engaged in open discussion and questions/answers. The following provides a general summary of comments:

- ◆ It is vital to make improvements to parks, trails, facilities, etc., in such as way as to make everyone happy.
- ◆ The survey seems to indicate that lighting of parks and trails is an issue with citizens.
- ◆ Small neighborhood parks are valuable because they serve a range of citizens from young children to seniors.

- ◆ It is critical not to overlook possible opportunities for new neighborhood parks in geographic areas not currently served.
- ◆ Investing in existing facilities, per citizen survey, is a good concept.
- ◆ Curiosity regarding why Paramount was one of the most visited parks was expressed. Several Council and Board members noted the following:
  - It contains a variety of facilities
  - It provides a safe walking environment for seniors, people with baby strollers, etc.
  - As a previous neighbor, over time observed large numbers of people utilizing park in late afternoons to walk and utilize various other amenities
  - There are sidewalks in the nearby neighborhoods that provide accessible egress
- ◆ Survey noted that equal distribution of dollars throughout the City is important.
- ◆ Innis Arden is an area (22 acres) with potential for improved beach/shoreline access, nature trails, walking trails, etc.
- ◆ The following general comments relative to the park master planning process were made:
  - We should consider spending fewer dollars on master planning specific parks, and funnel those dollars to actual construction at parks
  - It seems that in some cases funding is too focused on planning rather than actual park construction/renovation/improvements
  - In situations where re-design is essential, will need to focus greater time and money on planning process including community involvement
  - In situations where park needs include renovations and/or minor improvements rather than re-design, should focus funding to a higher degree on construction rather than the planning process
- ◆ There may be opportunities to develop a cultural park based on Sister City relationship.
- ◆ Acquisition opportunities that may be possible:
  - 8 acres next to Hamlin
  - Develop a creative lease agreement of some sort to address gap in Briarcrest even if the space only allows for a small children’s park
  - Beach access south of Point Wells
  - 4 acres on south end of Apple Tree Lane
  - Consider developing a master plan that includes the short and long term (e.g., 2 to 3 years with evolution to long-term) in order to balance spending on the planning process and the construction itself
- ◆ Relative to trails survey finding, it is essential to connect/link existing parks to make them more accessible and available to a larger population. Linking of green spaces may be a “standard” to examine and integrate into the planning process.
- ◆ While citizens responded in the survey to their near-term needs, future needs especially for the active aging population must be addressed.

- ◆ The survey also indicated that safety and sidewalks around schools are important.

**QUESTIONS POSED TO COUNCIL/ PRCS AND THEIR RESPONSES:**

Several questions were then posed to the Council and Board with the following discussion:

1. *Is citizen comment aligned with the PRCS Departmental mission? Do you concur?*
  - *Response:* Yes, but improvements are important
2. *What do you think there should be more of, less of, relative to facilities and programs?*
  - *More of Responses:*
    - Maintain what we have
    - Effort to meet needs of changing demographics
    - Connections of trails especially to leverage greater usage and access of existing facilities
    - Sidewalks at schools for improved safety
    - Sports fields (survey did not separate youth and adult soccer, but did separate youth and adult baseball and softball)
    - Leverage through linkages within system
    - Leverage partner opportunities
    - Focus on short and long term funding and plans
  - **Less of Responses:** none discussed
  - *General Comment:* Perhaps the focus of citizen responses on improving existing facilities rather than acquiring new ones is somewhat due to the current economic times
3. *What are your top three priorities?*
  - Acquisition
  - Trail development
  - Lighting trails
  - Maintain/upgrade current system (6)
  - Balance improvements with ability to maintain in the long-run (2)
  - Revisit standard
  - Seek partnerships (e.g., pocket parks and others for unique opportunities)
  - Maintain/improve programs for all ages
  - Linkages of facilities to leverage upgrades

- Lighting to extend usage hours (2)

**CONSIDERATION FOR BOND SURVEY:**

Based on the discussion, additional elements and topics for Wendy and Ron to consider probing through the Bond Survey include the following:

- ◆ Types of trails that are most wanted (e.g., off/on street, nature/interpretive, loops, connectors, hard/soft surface, trail lighting, etc.)
- ◆ Types of amenities that citizens equate with neighborhood parks as compared to community parks
  - Some of the key improvements citizens prefer for the parks they visit most often are most typically found at community parks (e.g., restrooms). It is critical to determine which amenities citizens see as most important for neighborhood parks as well as for community parks.
  - With the data from the existing needs assessment survey, it may be possible to cross-tab “most important improvements” with “parks visited most often” to gather additional insight about the most important improvements for both neighborhood and community parks. The other option is to conduct additional probing through the Bond Survey.
- ◆ In the survey, the need for youth and adult baseball and softball fields was expressed separated whereas soccer was combined. How can the need and support for multipurpose fields be determined? Can the positive responses relative to youth/adult baseball/softball be combined, and if so, does this tell a different story? Can this be compared to soccer field needs as “apples to apples?”
- ◆ Additional probing into lighting improvement identified in needs assessment survey. Does this mean within parks (e.g., parking lots, along walkways to/from park amenities such as sports fields, etc.) or does it mean lighting trails such as Interurban or trails within parks?